



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

IFW

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/800,985	03/14/2004	Christopher Rudd		2092

7590
Christopher Rudd
Immune Ventures Corp.
39E Bellis Circle
Cambridge, MA 02140

10/17/2006



EXAMINER

SCHLIENTZ, NATHAN W

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1616

DATE MAILED: 10/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

3

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/800,985

Applicant(s)

RUDD, CHRISTOPHER

Examiner

Nathan W. Schlientz

Art Unit

1616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 March 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-18 are pending.

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1, 3, 5, 9-12, 14, and 15, drawn to a method of enhancing CD28 mediated and dependent T-cell responses against infection by administering a **peptide**, classified in class 514, subclass 2.
 - II. Claims 1, 3, 7, 9-12, 14, and 15, drawn to a method of enhancing CD28 mediated and dependent T-cell responses against infection by administering **SB415286**, classified in class 514, subclass 426.
 - III. Claims 1, 3, 7, 9-12, 14, and 15, drawn to a method of enhancing CD28 mediated and dependent T-cell responses against infection by administering **lithium chloride**, classified in class 424, subclass 677.
 - IV. Claims 2, 4, and 6, drawn to a medicament comprising a **peptide**, classified in class 514, subclass 2.
 - V. Claims 2, 4, and 8, drawn to a medicament comprising **SB415286**, classified in class 514, subclass 426.
 - VI. Claims 2, 4, and 8, drawn to a medicament comprising **lithium chloride**, classified in class 424, subclass 677.

Art Unit: 1616

VII. Claim 13, drawn to a method for screening or identifying a compound, classified in class 435, subclass 7.71.

VIII. Claims 16-18, drawn to a medicament comprising a reagent that ligates CD28, classified in class 514, subclass 21 (in so far as CD80 is the said medicament).

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

2. Inventions I-III and VII are directed to related processes. The related inventions are distinct if (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed are materially different in design. Inventions I-III are drawn to methods of enhancing CD28 mediated and dependent T-cell responses through administering materially different drugs. Invention VII is drawn to a method for screening or identifying a compound. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

3. Inventions IV-VI, and VIII are directed to related products. The related inventions are distinct if the (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the

Art Unit: 1616

inventions as claimed have a materially different design. Inventions IV-VI are drawn to medicaments comprising materially different drugs. Invention VIII is drawn to a medicament comprising a reagent that ligates CD28. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

4. Inventions IV-VI, and VIII and inventions I-III and VII are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case SB216763 has been shown to be a potent inhibitor of GSK-3 α activity and could be used in the present invention (see Coghlan, entire document, especially the abstract).

5. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions require a different field of search (see MPEP § 808.02), have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification and recognized divergent subject matter. Therefore, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

6. A telephone call was made to Mr. Christopher Rudd on 10/05/06 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement. However, the phone number on file, 617-864-5251, is no longer in service.

Art Unit: 1616

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Notice of Possible Rejoinder

7. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

Art Unit: 1616

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Contact Information


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nathan W. Schlientz whose telephone number is 571-272-9924. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM, Monday through Friday.

Art Unit: 1616

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Johann Richter can be reached on 571-272-0646. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Nathan W. Schlientz, Ph.D.
Patent Examiner
Technology Center 1600

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Johann Richter', with a large, stylized initial 'J' and a horizontal line extending from the end of the signature.

Johann Richter, Ph.D., Esq.
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 1600

IC 1600

REIMSEN

Organization Bldg/Room

United States Patent and Trademark Office

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

If Undeliverable Return in Ten Days

OFFICIAL BUSINESS
PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE, \$300

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER


NIXIE

3013 1 15 10/20/06

RETURN TO SENDER
ATTEMPTED-NOT KNOWN
UNABLE TO FORWARD
RETURN TO SENDER



ANK
40-74



UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE
02-1A
0004205065
MAILED FROM

RECEIVED
OCT 26 2006
USPTO MAIL CENTER

3